John Stone.

NOTES

67 ON 4. 51. 83

Mr. *F. D's* RESULT

Of a Dialogue concerning the

MIDDLE STATE

OF

SOULS:

In a LETTER from

Thomas White Gent.

PARIS MCIƆLX.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

2877:78

To his much esteemed Friend Mr. *F. D.*

Ever honoured Sir,

FOR such both your Prudence and Learning have made you to me, and specially your rich Systeme, the citing whereof in this your *Result*, gave me full notice of your Person, though many good passages in your Book did partly interpret to me the fairly prognosticating Ciphers of your Name in the Frontispiece. I am glad to encounter an adversary who knows what Divinity is, and can in due proportion mingle together subtilty with civility. Therefore I also intend to my power, to joyn the satisfaction I am able to offer you with the respect your grave carriage of the controversy deserves, being really perswaded it

was no intereſt nor paſſion moved you to write, nor vain glory to put it in print, *but the intreaty of ſuch who may command*, as you ingeniouſly expreſs your ſelf; and a cordial perſwaſion of the truth of your Tenet.

To begin then with your Preface, give me leave to advertiſe you of a miſtake (as I think) in the word *Ariſtophanes*, which I will courteouſly hope, you conceive imports no more then a Divulger of high and myſterious truths among people uncapable of ſuch Doctrins, for ſo your following diſcourſe intimates. But becauſe *Ariſtophanes* did it with Flouts and Jeers (for which the ſect of Poets whoſe writings were called *Comædia priſca* was ſilenced) ſome Readers may poſſibly interpret you to caſt a blemiſh on a Perſon, whoſe true worth and vertue as much ſecures him from deſerving it, as your diſcreet and friendly nature can reſtrain you from meaning it.

Afterward you add that the Gentleman who rendred that Treatiſe into Engliſh, was *inſtrumental of great ſcandal*. You are not ignorant that ſcandals muſt come; nor am I, that woe be to him by whom they come. But both you and I are bound to under-

underſtand thoſe words with this neceſſary caution, by whoſe *fault*, not by whoſe *act* they come. Elſe even our Bleſſed Saviour himſelf was an occaſion of ſcandal; but ſuch, as woe be unto them who are ſcandaliz'd in Him. The Quality therefore of the cauſe, not the effect is chiefly to be examin'd ere we charge on any ſo foul an imputation. Turn then your impartiall eyes on the two ſides of the Controverſy, and ſee the great and many inconveniences viſible and ſenſible that grow upon the Church, in caſe the Affirmative which you ſuſtain, be falſe.

You are not one, I'm ſure, who think Prieſts cannot be too many, but wiſely judg their number well contriv'd, when the ends they are ordain'd for are fully comply'd with: ſo that the Church be neither over-charg'd by the multitude, nor unprovided by the paucity of her ſpiritual Governours. Conſider the dignity of the Office, and the difficulty of obſerving its Obligations, and you wil ſoon diſcover 'tis too high and perfect a Calling for a multitude. Conſider the miſchief if the unworthy Prieſts (of which ſome few I confeſs muſt ſtill be tolerated while we live in this World of fleſh and blood) bear any nota-

ble proportion to the number of the worthy ones, how the ſacredſt Profeſſion on Earth is under-valued, their Sermons inefficacious, their Sacraments neglected, and the whole life and vigour of Chriſtianity extenuated and endanger'd. Conſider what a vaſt crowd of young Scholars thruſt themſelves into theſe holy Orders by occaſion of getting Souls *ſuddenly* out of Purgatory; to which they often think themſelves ſufficiently qualified with a very mean degree, God knows, of Vertue or Learning.

Conſider how apt this opinion is to breed in all the World a neglect of venial ſins when they ſhall be taught that a Maſs or two, or a few prayers put a period to all their pains they can fear in Purgatory. And, as for mortal ſins, even they alſo will find too much encouragement from ſo ſlack a Diſcipline. Tis but being afraid of Hell; and upon that, receiving Abſolution; and then, procuring ſome devotions (eſpecially if in a proper place) and the Soul that has lived its whole life in folly and worſe, is inſtantly taken up into all the glories of Paradiſe. What can more dangerouſly weaken if not quite aboliſh that beſt and onely immediate diſpoſition of our

our Souls for Heaven, the hearty love of God above all things? what can be poſſibly more prejudiciall to them that are in the Church, or more ſcandalous to them that are out of it?

Conſider farther, how widows and poor folks defraud their children and Parents of ſuch helps as elſe they could afford them, did not the eager hope of a hafty releaſe from thoſe dreadfull pains, divert their charities another way. And truly in my conceit, with a great deal of reaſon, if your opinion be the right: for who to deliver himſelf from the rack, would not think it fit, his friends, how near ſoever, ſhould ſuffer a little hunger? or who, that believes your tenet, is not bound, in true and wiſe charity to purchaſe at any rate, even with the diſinheriting his poſterity, ſo great a happineſs to his own Soul as the enjoyment of Heaven within a day or week after his departure from hence? nay, more, what heir is not oblig'd in duty to give away the vain riches of this tranſitory world to gain ſo ſpeedy an Eternity for his Father, whoſe over-loving him perhaps made him need it?

Add to this, the unedifying imputation of Avarice and Fraud upon ſuch as gain by

theſe offices (and I pray God it be without juſt cauſe;) while they promiſe far more then they know they can perform. The words they expoſe to the people on the faces of their Churches and Altars ſpeak roundly, like fair Chap-men, *let a Maſs be ſaid, and the Soul of your friend ſhall be deliver'd*; or, to that effect: and who can be uncharitable enough, or ſuch a ſilly Merchant as not to diſburſe a little to procure ſo great a benefit at ſo cheap a rate? but when you come to examin the performance on their ſide, it amounts to no more then this ſhort payment; They have offer'd up their prayers for you, and muſt leave the ſucceſs to Gods mercy, and this is well, and the truth; but why then did you tell them, when you took their mony, that their friend ſhould be deliver'd, in what Court would ſo fraudulent a Plea be allowed? If you will expreſly undertake, for my ten or twenty pounds which I really give you to pay my debts and free me out of priſon; and when I look for Effects as reall as my mony, you put me off with this cold comfort, that you have intreated for me, but muſt leave the deciſion of the cauſe to the ſentence of the Judg. May I not expect you ſhould ſhew

me

me at leaſt ſome aſſurance from the Judg himſelf, that he wil effectually releaſe me? & that within the time you made me believe, when I parted with my mony? and may I not, if you fail in that, charge you with deceiving me? Is not this caſe a little too near that unhappy ſcandal on which *Luther* took ſo faſt hold that he pull'd down the Churches of whole Provinces by it? What ſhall I ſay of the averting men from cultivating the inward affections of their hearts, in which the Kingdom of God reſides, to the too much relying on works done by others? what of the laying even to Gods own charge as it were a kind of Simony, ſuch practiſes being eaſily interpretable to a bad ſence as if he diſpenſed his ſpirituall goods with a reſpect to the quantity of what is given, and that the poor Widows mite cannot have ſo great an effect as a Dives's talent. And though much of what I now am diſcourſing be chiefly applyable to Priviledg'd Altars and Scapulars, and ſuch like abus'd devotions, yet is it in a degree true of thoſe who to invite Cuſtomers boldly aſſure them if they ſhall procure ſo many Maſſes, of a very delivery, quick, though not determinately known. But ſuppoſe the Affirmative of intermedi-

al

al Releaſe be in it ſelf true; yet how does it appear to us? the effects concern not any living perſon, but are altogether inviſible and out of our reach; which till they are ſufficiently evidenced to us, muſt needs be uncertain to us, and ſo continually diſputable, if not improbable, whoſe ſettlement muſt depend on the determination of this Queſtion, before which final deciſion 'tis not improper that Scholars try their utmoſt endeavours, to examin and prepare both ſides for diſcovery of the truth. Nor is it in the leaſt my intention to charge the Church with any of theſe irregularities; but onely to refute the errours, and reprove the abuſes of particular perſons; wherein I have the ſure warrant of the Council of *Trent*, which while it forbids ſuch incertain Doctrins, commands to oppoſe them that preach'em.

Theſe and many other ſuch obſervations (of which no ſubject, that I know, more plentifull) well conſider'd; permit the Ingenious Gentleman to think the reſcuing Ladies devotions from flight and hazardous practiſes to ſolid and aſſured pieties, judiciouſly preferrable to the ſmall and ſhort diſſentions that poſſibly may ſpring out of the more generall divulging

ſuch

ſuch diſcourſes: Nor did he this, till the loud and many clamours of ſome buſy heads againſt the Opinion, while it lay cloſe wrapt up in its native dark Latin, render'd the Tranſlation, in his judgment, abſolutely neceſſary. For the Latin Book I am to anſwer; for the Engliſh, they who talk ſo much in Engliſh againſt it, and, were the People ſuch as they ſhould be, thoſe kind of Controverſies might eaſily be managed without any breach of charity at all, or the leaſt diminution of their mutuall correſpondence; it being our duty as in matters of Faith to be zealous and exactly uniform, ſo in other debates to be temperate and prudently condeſcending. Let every one but ſeriouſly read the 13 Page of your *Reſult*, and I doubt not they will proceed in this point as calmly and warily as you do. There you tell us, *that ſome things have been deliver'd to poſterity in the Church which could never obtain more authority then Opinion, as is made evident in your Syſtem, even in grave Subjects: but how to diſtinguiſh ſuch from Doctrins of a higher nature, in caſe Holy Church did not convey clearly their qualification with them as in ſome caſes evidently It did, and in ſome caſes It did not, as there you give In-*

ſtances)

ſtances; then the onely way is to return to General Councils, *that they according to their Office may* Conquiſitione facta, *after the Example of the Apoſtles*, juridically *appoint to each their Seats, where all muſt acquieſce.* Thus you; and excellently well: and to this Tryall I freely ſubmit all my Opinions, how evident ſoever they may appear to my ſelf. You cite not the particular place, and I happend to light on one which treated ſuch buſineſſes, and finding it very proper I contented my ſelf, and 'tis *Syſtem c.* 32. *p.* 335. *&c.* where, (as indeed all over that Book, it being a Magazine of curious Queſtions and Antiquities) I met with ſome inſtances, which as they ſatisfy'd me, will I hope, if diligently perus'd, content my Reader too, there he ſhould ſee collected together, not onely univerſall Catholick Perſwaſions, but ſome Conciliary Definitions unallow'd by Divines to be Points of Faith. But you ſay, this Point is not among 'em, and I ſay as tender Points as this, are among 'em; What think you of the Aſſumption of our Lady? What of the Spirituality of Angels? this, embrac'd by all Scholars; that, by all People. Beſides, do you not there your ſelf acknowledge that very many

Orthodox

Orthodox Divines hold, though all the Fathers admit this or that Point, it does not follow, we ſhould preſently pronounce it *of faith*; and this, even when the matter is of weight and conſequence. To conclude this introduction, I ſhall take leave to tranſcribe out of the ſame Place onely theſe few ſayings, recommending them to the ſerious Conſideration of the paſſionate and byaſſed Reader. The firſt ſhall be that of *Bellarmin*; *In Conſiliis maxima pars Actorum ad Fidem non pertinet, ſed tantum ipſa nuda Decreta, & ea non omnia, ſed tantum quæ proponuntur tanquam de fide.* Another, of Innocent the third, *Judicium Eccleſiæ nonnunquam opinionem ſequitur quam & fallere ſæpe continget & falli.* The third, of Saint *Aug. Sentiat quiſque quod libet tantum contra Apoſtolicam manifeſtiſſimam Fidem non ſentiat.* And now Sir, me thinks the Queſtion betwixt you and me is reduced to ſo narrow a compaſs, that we may ſee it all with one proſpect, and hope by that means to ſee it well; whereas, they that ſpread their view wildly at too much at once, have many things before their eyes, but nothing in their ſight.

Notes

Notes on the first Chapter.

YOur first Chapter did somewhat surprise me, for being used to expect in your writings, Authorities express and driven home, I was amazed to find the main question of your work, past slightly over with a generall assertion that the Fathers say what you intend, without directly producing Testimonies of sufficient either weight or number to evince your position. The Council of *Florence* I have taken notice of sufficiently in my answer to the Vindicator, which I shall endeavour to get presented to you. The Result of my discourse there in short, is that I acknowledg all the *Council and* Pope assert, and shew they do not affirm what you pretend.

Your onely Testimony out of Saint *John Damascen* perplexed me, for I know your goodness so great, that you would not wittingly impose upon your Auditory, and esteemed your Criticism in Fathers so exact, that you would not permit such a notable

notable miſtake to gain credit upon you: How then happens it that you ſo confidently cite an Oration of Saint *John Damaſcen*, which Catholicks either doubt not to be his, or make a ſhamefull excuſe for writing it, ſaying he was too credulous to fabulous narrations? In it are recorded the famous tales of *Trajan* and *Falconilla*, ſaved from Hell by the prayers of Saint *Gregory* and Saint *Thecla*. There is the monſtrous ſtory which you are pleaſed to recount to your Readers of an Heathens ſcull that told a good Eremite they received ſome comfort when they were pray'd for. Which ſtory is taken either out of *Palladius* his *Hiſtoria Lauſiaca*, or elſe *Evagrius* his *Vita Patrum*, of which Saint *Hierom* teſtifies onely the firſt life to be true, and even in it, is that notorious Romance of *Macarius Romanus*. And of the former, the ſame Saint *Hierom* teſtifies he was an Origeniſt: wherefore the Authour of this Oration attributed to St. *John Damaſcen* is juſtly fear'd to have himſelf alſo been one, ſeeing his fine ſtories aym at the comfort of the damned. Beſides, our Criticks tell us this ſtory is impoſed on the great Saint *Macarius*, being originally written of another of the

ſame

ſame name, and the Oratour adding that the anſwer was *from God*, whereas the Original attributes it to the ſcull of a dead heathen Prieſt, and ſo far likelier came from the Devil.

All the reſt you ſay in this Chapter is juſt the Doctrin of your Epiſtolar Antagoniſt as far as you let us underſtand his mind and mine too; to wit, that *to deny prayers profit the dead cometh from the Devil.* The general reſiſtence you plead againſt this Doctrin of Souls continuance in Purgatory, finds a parallel in all popular perſwaſions how weakly grounded ſoever, which none but diſcreet perſons can endure to hear oppoſed; And for the anſwer I intreat your pardon, if I remit you to my late Reply to the Vindicator. For the reſt you ſeem to preſs us that we muſt take your ſence of the Fathers and Councils, telling us it is the onely ingenious one, and others are but extorted meanings. Truly I believe you ſpeak what you think, but I deſire you, think what you ſpeak, that is, examin it well, for I believe your thinking is bred *ex conſuetudine videndi*; your education hath been amongſt them who dayly practiſ'd it; you hear the Bells ever ringing to ſuch devotions; you

ſee

ſee the cuſtom ſpread over all the Weſtern Church, and do not lift up your eyes to the beginning of it, and therefore you think it was ever ſo, and that it is the ſence of thoſe great Authorities.

But I cannot omit a by-word of yours, that it *is eaſie to elude the Fathers by the voluntary gloſſes of blaſted Authors.* Is this ſpoken like a Controvertiſt? like a victorious and crowned Champion over Heretiques, and that by weapons out of the Fathers, as you are eſteemed, and worthily too? When you bring Fathers againſt any of them, do you profeſs they may be eaſily anſwer'd by blaſted Authors? Whence then comes it, that in this Controverſie you flie to an evaſion ſo unprofitable to your ſelf, injurious to the Fathers, and advantageous to the common Enemy? but that you eſteem the Fathers you bring come not home to the point, and that they muſt be inched out by a pious affection; whereof, to tell you my mind, I believe all ſpeciouſneſs of piety, which prevents the underſtanding from being indifferent to judge of the truth, is in very deed a piece of impiety and temerity. And in our preſent Controverſie, if the words of the Fathers by which they attribute purging

of souls to the fire of Judgment be not beyond conteſt, I will yeeld the whole cauſe: (Some I have cited in my Treatiſe, and more I can cite, if neceſſity requires,) but if they be, why is it not lawfull for me to alledge them, though Heretiques make uſe of them for an evil end? charge either the Fathers for writing ſo, or the Heretiques for abuſing them; however I I am free.

Notes on the ſecond and third Chapters.

THeſe 2 Chapters go without Proofs, being as it were but inferences from the pretended Ones of the Firſt; and conſequently their fate depends on the fortune of their Leaders, which I hope I have already ſufficiently diſabled. Yet give me leave here to add one Caution that may accompany you in your journey to ask all the Catholick world, whether they believe a Releaſe of Souls out of Purgatory ordinarily obtainable before the day of Judgment as an Article of their faith; or onely aſſent to it as a current truth, which they never

never doubted, nor ever examin'd. Should you proceed thus warily, I believe your number would ſtrangely diminiſh; how many think you would fall off, as not conceiving themſelves able to examin ſo hard a Queſtion? how many of the learned would confeſs, the more they impartially conſider it, the more they diſcover reaſons not to be too confident of its being a point of Faith: eſpecially, if they have the fortune to compare it with other common perſwaſions, which themſelves acknowledg Univerſal and ancient, yet not of Faith, as that of material fire now in Hell and Purgatory, *&c.* how few then will the number of your Voters be? ſet but aſide all thoſe who think there's literal fire there, (which you are bound to do, becauſe they believe it certainly, yet is it not of Faith) and preſently your multitude in *Spain*, *Italy*, *Turky*, and *Soria*, whither you went for witneſſes, will ſhrink into a ſlender and inconſiderable number.

Whereas you add, *we never read in Scriptures, Fathers, or Councils, that all thoſe that go to Purgatory muſt neceſſarily be detaind there without any relief till the day of Judgment.* I anſwer, firſt, 'tis but a negative Argument. Secondly, It plainly

agrees with my Opinion, who hold them *relieved there* as well as you, though I explicate my Tenet another way. Which here I intend in brief to ſhew you.

Wherein, that we may proceed more ſafely, let us firſt ſee how far we agree, and where we begin to differ. We agree that there is a Purgatory; and that ſouls there detain'd, are helpt or reliev'd by the prayers of the faithfull. We begin to differ, in explicating what we conceive by relief; and we wholy diſagree in the *time* of ordinary deliverableneſs.

Your conception of Relief, I imagin, is, that when prayers are ſaid for the departed, their ſouls are really changed from the ſtate of pains they were in before, to one of a milder affliction; where they muſt expect till ſome new cauſe raiſe them a ſtep higher; and ſo by degrees, having paſt over all thoſe ſteps, are at laſt admitted into heaven; your ſelf will agree theſe words are metaphoricall, and tranſlated from our manner of ſpeaking; and I gather, and conceive the ſenſe too, of theſe words, is tranſlated from our thinking; and indeed, if we mind our ſelves well, we ſhall ſtill find our words of the ſame piece with our notions: now we, being converſant

verſant onely with our bodies, frame all our notions after their meaſure, and ſpeak, and think too, generally, of ſpirits, and even of God himſelf, as of things we daily commerce with. Do we not ſtill fancy ſuch motions, changes, and other operations among Angels as we ſee here among our ſelves? Does not the very Scripture in condeſcendence to us, uſe the ſame method? In moſt of which caſes, both you and I are equally engaged to ſeek out a wiſer meaning, then appears in the naked expreſſions; this task is common to all Divines to endeavour the verifying theſe phraſes (ſo groſly abſurd in their bare letter) by an explication that may ſtrictly and rigorouſly maintain them to be true.

The Spirits I ſhall treat of to this purpoſe, are God, the bleſſed in heaven, and the ſouls in Purgatory. And to begin with God, the beginning of all things, what do we conceit of him, when we read of his being angry, and pleaſed; his reſolving to puniſh, and afterwards repenting; his having eyes and hands; his going from place to place; his abiding from generation to generation; his ſeeing ſucceſſively, and decreeing conditionally, and a thouſand other inſtances; all this Divines muſt, and

do find ways to verify of One ſimple and abſolute unchangeable Eſſence, whoſe being and knowing, and willing, is altogether, without the leaſt ſhadow of ſucceſſion for ever. All this Divines will ſay, was perfect in God from the firſt inſtant, as I may call it, of his Being; that is, from eternity; and yet our condition obliges us to ſpeak, and even think of all this, in a way infinitly below the ſevere truth, though more or leſs approaching to it, according to the pitch of our capacities.

For Angels, as we read many of the like paſſages concerning them, and their actions; ſo the like explications (with obſervance of a due proportion betwixt the Creator and the creature) be applied to them. The Angels, we know, rejoyce at the converſion of a ſinner; and ſure it were no blameable practice to allow for that joy ſome little ſhare in our intention; and perhaps to begin a particular devotion, directed *to the increaſe of joy in the Saints and Angels*, would be as laudable an invention as ſome that are highly commended. Every day new ſinners are converted; every day new joy is among the Angels for thoſe converſions. How muſt we fairly reconcile the difficulties? the Scriptures

ſay

ſay they receive joy, and Divinity ſayes their nature is fixt: In our ſolemneſt oblations we pray it may profit the Saints to glory: and our Doctors hold they are *in termino*, and no longer in the *Way*. Can a change conſiſt with fixure? and a going on, with being at the end? in rigor we ſee it is impoſſible, and therefore muſt caſt about to find out the Riddle, which is not ſo hard as we imagin, if we take the right courſe to ſeek. Firſt, let us ſever the parties: Scriptures and Liturgies are on one ſide, Divines on the other. Were the queſtion of the *truth of the words*, without preciſely determining the particular ſenſe, I ſhould clearly follow the former: but if it be onely of the *Propriety of their ſignification*, *and what is ſeverely verifiable of them*, I make no ſcruple to adhere to the later; and this, without the leaſt diminution to the other. The authority of thoſe, I confeſs, is more ſacred and venerable: but the reaſonings of theſe, I cannot deny, are more exact and artificiall; each fitteſt for its peculiar office. Thoſe undertake the inſtruction of the world, and perform it according to the capacity of the perſons they deal with; theſe onely intend their notions for the Learned, and

their higheſt praiſe is, to illuſtrate and fortifie and improve true Religion by true Reaſon.

But, to come neerer our particular queſtion; when we pray to Saints or Angels, do we not hope we move them *then* to go make their addreſſes to God for us, which they were not doing *before*? do we not expect that *at the time* of our prayers to them, they ſhould entertain a *new affection* of charity to us; and even ground our devotion on this expectance? and wiſely too, till our underſtandings be elevated to more perfect apprehenſions; yet in a ſtrict *Examin*, all theſe our conceits are very unſuitable to what really paſſes among theſe pure ſpirits.

Nor are we diſappointed in the leaſt of the fruit of our prayers, though we never ſo much apprehend the manner either of their hearing us, or interceding for us: which aſſurance ought to ſuffice the unlearned; whoſe ſincere devotion will infallibly ſave them without theſe ſubtilties: the more ſpeculative heads will find, if they ſearch for it, other ſatisfaction.

To theſe inquiries, perhaps this one conſideration may give ſome aſſurance; it is clear, in God, (as we ſaid above) all is eternall,

eternall, and whatever we read or imagin as done ſucceſſively in Him, muſt be entirely verified of his firſt inſtant, were there any ſuch beginning of exiſtence in his perfect eternity. Why may not the ſame be affirmed proportionally of Angels, whoſe being, though neither independent, nor infinit, yet is purely ſpirituall, and their duration altogether? and conſequently the joy, our good works give them, was really in them at their beginning; with relation indeed, and dependance on our converſions, which were to happen afterwards in ſucceſſion of time, but lodg'd in their breſts altogether at firſt, by the large fore knowledge wherewith their bounteous God endued them: elſe what a ſtrange perpetuall motion would there be in heaven, if every good or bad work of all the men on earth, ſhould beget a new affection of joy or grief in all the Angels of heaven, (I ſuppoſe our ſins diſpleaſe them, as they do God; and contriſtate them, as they do the holy Ghoſt) nor ſhall I ſo far diſtruſt my Reader as to doubt his admittance of the ſame concluſions for Saints as well as Angels; ſince they both agree in the common notion of *Spirits*.

To

To apply this now to our preſent Caſe; As our converſions procure joy to the Angels, without making any new change in them; why may not our prayers procure *relief* to the ſouls in Purgatory without making any new change in them? As all that we expreſs in terms of ſucceſſion whē we ſpeak of Angels, is in Theology ſufficiently verify'd, by referring it to the firſt inſtant of their fixed being; why may not alſo the *Relief* we impetrate in ſucceſſion of time for ſouls departed, be ſufficiently verify'd by referring it to the firſt inſtant of their fixt being or ſeparation?

I confeſs I know not how to find an unevenneſs in the two ſides, they are ſo exactly parallel: Addition of joy in one; diminution of pains in the other: new honour to the one; new relief to the other; and both from the ſame act, the ſame prayer, the ſame oblation. If the whole body of Catholikes expect to alter the ſorrows of the ſouls departed, do they not alſo expect to advance the honour of the Saints and Angels, nay, even of God himſelf? If that be *univerſally* practiſed and with *ſuch hope*, is not this ſo too? If the common people feel their imaginations check at our interpretation of that; would they not be

as

as much ſtartled, did they ſtrongly reflect on't, at the Schoolmens explication of this? both contain the ſame difficulty; and therefore both require the ſame method to anſwer: and, as whatever belongs to man in the quality of a *living creature*, belongs to a horſe or lion by the ſame title: ſo every attribute incident to Angels purely as they are *ſpirits*, may juſtly be claim'd by any to whom that notion of *ſpirit* is truly appliable.

Now, ſouls departed have, in my opinion, ſo large a knowledge given them immediatly upon their firſt ſeparation, that they aſſuredly know all the good that they have done for them, both by occaſion of what themſelves procur'd, and by the voluntary charity of others; as alſo what ſhall be their portion at the day of Judgment, compounded of all theſe concurrent cauſes; and ſo are now, from the firſt moment of their unclothing, in that degree of hope and joy which thoſe foreſights produce: which yet ought not in the leaſt to cool our devotions towards them, ſince they never ſhould foreknow that our prayers obtain for them thoſe advantages, if indeed we did not really pray for them.

Thus

Thus far I am drawn in defence of truth and my ſelf, both beyond my intention, and againſt my inclination: but ſtill it ſometimes happens, that what is not enough for ſome, is too much for others.

To conclude then, As prayers for the dead with hope of procuring them relief; is a traditionary doctrine and practice, ſo prayers to Saints and Angels (and even to God himſelf) with perſwaſion of advancing their glory. is a traditionary doctrine and practiſe: but whether any reall intrinſick change among thoſe *ſpirits* be wrought ſucceſſively, and occaſionally after our ſublunary faſhion, is meerly a Theological inquiry, and no traditionary either doctrine or practiſe.

In the third Chapter, you touch upon the Reaſons of praying for the dead in particular; but becauſe you handle it afterwards on ſet purpoſe; I may lawfully defer the anſwer till I meet with it again; in the mean time, I freely ſubſcribe to every word of the teſtimony you bring from Saint *Auſtin*.

Notes on the fourth Chapter.

HEre you pretend to deliver the ſenſe of the Liturgies, both of the *Greek* and *Latin* Church. My firſt note is that where Saint *James prayes God to cauſe the ſouls to reſt with the Saints*; You ſeek to perſwade the Reader, that we explicate it to pray, *that they may not reſt till* (nay more till *after*) *the day of Judgment*: which I confeſs to be a jeer, fit enough perhaps for the merry trifling Vindicator, but you much undervalue your ſelf to uſe ſcoffing in ſtead of Reaſon. You tell us too, the Fathers pray conſtantly for a *preſent* help, but when you cite words, nothing appears, but the common effect in which both ſides agree.

One place you have out of Saint *Ambroſe* which hath ſome ſhew, *I loved him*, ſaith Saint *Ambroſe*, *and therefore I will accompany him to the kingdom of heaven, nor will I forſake him, till by tears and prayers I bring him whither his own deſerts call him.* Theſe words you interpret to ſignifie materiall

teriall time, that he wil pray ſo long till he hath brought him out of Purgatory into Heaven: I on the other ſide conceive it onely an expreſſion of the fervency of the prayer which he would make for him. Let us weigh whether explication be the more rationall. To undertake what I ſay, was in Saint *Ambroſe*'s power, being no more then to promiſe the aſſiſtance which was in the Churches power. The other ſenſe which you make, requires that Saint *Ambroſe* ſhould expect a revelation to know when his ſoul went to heaven, elſe he muſt never give over praying for him; that he ſhould enter into the counſels of God, and underſtand both what puniſhment was due to *Theodoſius*, and what quantity of prayer was enough to releaſe him. Add to this the doctrin of both Fathers and Schoolmen, that there is no promiſe of God that a good mans prayers ſhall be heard for others; and therefore as to us, 'tis wholy incertain. Wherein then are the prayers of thoſe who think with me leſs fruitfull to their departed friends, then theirs, who call to God for a determinate or immediate delivery? If the releaſe be granted when it ſuits with the juſtice and mercy of God, as doubtleſs it is,

is, then both their prayers are equall, and this onely difference is between them, as to the time, one prays with more importunity, the other with more ſubmiſſion; but, as to the deſire of benefiting, both with the ſame affection.

Next you urge Saint *Chryſoſtom*, ſaying, the dead receive ſome comfort if offerings be made for them; and conclude from that word *ſome*, as if it could not ſignifie heaven. But as you prettily preſs *quiddam*, ſo will I begg leave to preſs the *future* Participle, *acceſſurum*; which quite ſpoils your pretence of *preſent change upon our prayers*; and being indeterminately *future*, may ſignifie indifferently, *the day of judgement*, and that *ſolatium quiddam* (as you put it) let it mean what it will, is given them. Now the word *ſome*, being abſtractive, ſutes very well with the intention of him who would evince, that prayers did aſſuredly benefit the dead; as is the method of all wary men, to uſe the commoneſt and ſureſt terms, without ingaging into particular degrees, unleſs thoſe degrees were the very queſtion. And do you think there are not degrees too of rewards in heaven? is there not the reward of a *Prophet*? and that of a *Diſciple*? that which

is

is proportion'd to the giving a cup of cold water, and all this in the eſſentiall part of beatitude; every act of charity increaſing it to its worth and degree? Beſides, will you deny accidentall rewards in heaven?

Then you inſiſt upon revelations of Saint *Gregory* and Venerable *Bede*, and make an advantage of their not being contradicted, which conſequence I do not underſtand. For how many things are there written in divers Authors, both ancient and modern, neither believed, nor contradicted? or if contradicted, both themſelves and contradictions generally neglected? you add, that both *Greeks* and *Latines* poſitively approved of them. True it is, *Gregory* the third, according to *Photius* (who could not well be ignorant of it, being ſo learned a perſon, eſpecially in Books and Authors) was the Writer of thoſe Dialogues; a *Syrian* born, and for his piety, exalted to the Popedome; and *Zacharias*, by birth a *Grecian*, and for his goodneſs promoted alſo to the ſame dignity, thought them fit to be communicated to *Greece*, but with what ſucceſs I cannot give you any account. Yet I dare ſay, no grave Divine now living, will undertake to juſtifie thoſe Revelations, as having

ever

ever ſome ſmack that agrees not with Catholique Doctrin. Venerable *Bede's* Revelations likewiſe have certain twangs of ſtrangeneſs in them, which ſhew that they cannot bear the touch of a Theologicall examination; and ſo, in a fair word, I anſwer you the Revelations both of the one and the other, are generally contradicted by Divines, and you can make no argument from them; but rather I may infer the effect of ſuch an origin is to be ſuſpected, and dangerous.

You ſay the *Sequence* of the Maſs for the dead, inculcates the horror of doomſday, to move good people to help the ſouls out of Purgatory before it come: As if you conceiv'd that day would be worſe to them, were they not help'd before; which Poſition, I confeſs, I underſtand not: Since it is the generall Doctrin that the ſame doom is given in the particular judgement, and there is nothing then to be decided but Eternity. You bid me conſider, that theſe three alone, Saint *Gregory*, *Zachariat*, and Saint *Chryſoſtom*, carry the *Greek* and *Latin* Churches on their backs; but give me leave to ſay, that the Fathers and Authorities I have cited (of which you take no notice) are ſo far more nume-

rous and ſtrong then they, that (to uſe your own phraſe) they carry both their Churches and them and all on their backs.

You come at laſt to the Council of *Chalcedon*, and *Iſchyrions* action againſt *Dioſcorus*, for miſpending a Ladies monys, beſtowed at her death, for the good of her ſoul, ſo the text hath it, if I remember right, and not for the ſouls of the deceaſed, as you write it; though if it were ſo written, it were conformable to the uſe of the Church, and true Doctrine, and ſo I muſt put this alſo, amongſt your other proofs, which want a little of that pious affection to ſtretch them home to the purpoſe: For your argument hence, ſeems to ſtand thus; almes given for the dead are to be diſtributed faithfully; therefore ſouls are delivered before the day of Judgement.

After this ſevere conſequence of your own, you entertain'd the confidence to cenſure my explication of the offertory, for a ſophiſme; becauſe I think the puniſhment expreſt there, ſignifies that of Hell, not Purgatory. But certainly, it is a ſpice of great weakneſs, to believe the contrary without a ſtronger proof then your bare word; ſince the expreſſions are ſo horrid, that greater or more ſignificant can

can ſcarce be found, as, *the jaws of a Lion*, or *Devil*, *the deep dungeon*, that *Tartarus* (or the deepeſt ſink of *Hell*) *ſhould not ſwallow them up*. And in the Office of the dead, *where no order dwels, but everlaſting horror*; and other ſuch dreadfull phraſes. And the *Greeks* uſe to call it in their rituals, *Gehennam*, But why *ſedes refrigerii* ſhould ſpeak your purgatory, I am not capable of the conſequence. It may be ſaid by Writers, that refreſhment is given there, but ſure none before you, ever call'd that ſuffering ſtate, the *ſeat of refreſhment*.

Notes on the fifth Chapter.

AS your Chapter is ſhort, ſo ſhall my Notes. You ſay, tradition alone cannot prove faith in all Articles; but you prove it not; for neither the Council of *Trent*, nor Saint *Irenæus*, though the one ſay Catholike Faith is contained in both, and the other, that both are neceſſary for the Church, ſay that Tradition alone is not ſufficient; Rather Saint *Irenæus* ſaith

it is; as all thoſe Fathers muſt needs be underſtood to do, who in caſe of difficulty, ſend us to the Apoſtolicall Churches. But to be ſhort, I make you this argument: If Scripture teach ſomewhat that is not in Tradition, either Scripture in ſuch paſſages needs an Interpreter, or no. If none, can any ſenſible man perſwade himſelf, it hath not been the perpetuall doctrin of the Church, ſo it be in a point neceſſary to be known? And if Scripture do need an Interpreter, that interpreter binds the Church, and is the immediate Revealer, and he muſt have the Authority of ſuch a Propoſer, to oblige the Church to his interpretation. It is therefore a ſophiſm, to put the Scripture for a ſelf-ſufficient authority to bind the Church, in what is not known by tradition. But Scripture is neceſſary for condemnation of Heretiques in ſuch points as they pretend to deduce from it; and ſo the Council of *Trent* declares it ſelf, when it ſpeaks upon what ground it would proceed: What conſequents follow of this doctrin, we muſt expect your leiſure to declare, as yet I know none.

Notes

Notes upon the ſixth Chapter.

IN the beginning of the ſixth Chapter, I find little difference betwixt your doctrin and mine; For though you explicate *Ariſtotles Nunc* otherwiſe then I ſhould do, yet not being neceſſary to our purpoſe, it is not fit for me to take notice of it. Only I underſtand not how after you have very learnedly declared that the ſoul by its æviternity hath the ſucceſſion of the parts of pain all together, afterwards you put that a ſoul by twenty years duration in pain hath ſuffered ſo long the hard conſequents of that duration; For if the extenſion of time as far as concerns the intrinſecal exiſtence of the ſoul was all reſumed in æviternity, and æviternity was all together by the very initiating of it; I cannot apprehend the running of time by it, can add any intrinſecall conſequent, which was not in it by the very making.

You ſeem to add yet a greater Paradox, telling us notwithſtanding the being of æviternity all together, yet there is a pri-

ority of nature in it: which though I can conceive in cauſes and effects, as being different things, yet in a pure indiviſible it paſſes my underſtanding; ſpecially when the priority muſt be in ſucceſſion, where, when one part is, the other is not, Neither doth *Ariſtotle* help you, in whoſe doctrin the decreeing of the will is a ſucceſſive action, as depending on a corporall motion in the body. But this being the ſubtilty of a Scotiſt, I pray do not perſwade your ſelf, that in our doctrin (which makes the duration of the acts of the ſoul, the very duration of the ſoul) a change of act can be connaturally admitted.

You inſinuate ſomething of a Metaphyſicall charity, and that our doctrin is ſuſpected to account voluntarily aſſumed penance to be ſuperfluous, if not ſuperſtitious. Sir, I deſire you by the freedom you ſee in my writing, to ſpeak my meaning loud, not to mince any ſiniſter conceits fram'd of my Tenets. Truth loves light; and in this particular point, I will openly declare you my ſentiment: All auſterities or extern actions which either conduce to the breeding of charity in our ſelves and neighbours, or to the conſerving and increaſing

creaſing it in thoſe that have it, and to the extending of it by diffuſion into divers ſubjects; all this, though there be no obligation for the actions in common (which is meant by their being voluntary) I eſteem holy and ſanctified. But if any one ſhould think God takes pleaſure that we ſhould weaken or afflict our bodies, without intending profit to our ſouls, but meerly becauſe it pleaſes God, by and for it ſelf, I am of opinion that he makes God a tyrant, and that his action is both ſuperfluous and ſuperſtitious.

After this point, I find no diſagreement between us in any thing that concerns our queſtion; ſome words, at the very end, of the ſouls being exerciſed in a paſſive compliance, ſeem improper in our naturall and vulgar apprehenſions; but not falſe, and therefore not to be excepted againſt. Rather I congratulate among many other learned paſſages in this Chapter, your truly Catholike explication of the Churches Tenet, that while they are in Purgatory, their ſins remain, and that their ſins once perfectly taken away, they are ſtraight in Heaven; which is in my mind, the true ſenſe of the Bull and Council. Though I cannot approve what you attribute to

Scotus, that in Hell, *veniall sins* after certain proportion of punishment, *cease to be*, which I think a misgrounded and exotick conceit.

Notes on the seventh Chapter.

IN your seventh Chapter, you give *Aristotles* Reason for the unchangeableness of an abstracted soul, a very true and good one; but so dangerous, if not perfectly understood, that it hath precipitated divers Peripateticks into the suspicion (if not the reality) of being Atheists, because a substance without an action, is accounted among Philosophers frustraneous, and superfluous and incongruous to nature; to avoid which inconvenience, I must note that this is one difference betwixt bodily & spirituall substances, that bodies are essentially instrumentall, and therefore, where they are the directly and primarily intended parts of nature, they are frustraneous and idle, if they have not motion; but spirituall substances, especially separated souls, are certain beings, which are the end of bodies,

and

and of all changes: which end ſucceeds to changes as ſtanding ſtill and quiet doth to locall motion, as being at home to the journey by which we come thither, as health to curing, and manhood to growth: therefore ſouls are of themſelves uncapable of motion, as being now grown above materiality, which is the poſſibility to change and motion: and ſo by the negation of materiality in Peripatetick Philoſophy is demonſtrated the unchangeableneſs of ſouls. And who ever ſuppoſes a change in ſpirits, muſt ſuppoſe them alſo to have a potentiality to ſomewhat, which is to be attained by motion, as indeed thoſe Divines do, who put change in them.

This is *Ariſtotles* way throughout his Philoſophy, which thoſe Peripateticks underſtood not, who drew the mortality of the ſoul out of the deficiency of fancy in her. I am glad in the mean while, to meet an Adverſary ſo learned, as to penetrate the truth of *Ariſtotles* and S. *Thomas* his Tenet, and ſo ingenuous as to atteſt thoſe great Lights are on my ſide; by which it appears I am not left ſingular in my opinion; A favour the Vindicator would not aford me, but made it injurious in me to pretend or aſſert I built on Saint *Thomas* his Principles.

It

It is now time to retire from this digreſſion to the imputation you lay upon the Tranſlator, out of the Council of *Trent*, where it forbids difficult points to be preached to the vulgar; which you extend to the putting them into vulgar Languages, not without ſome wrong to all ſuch great wits, who are as capable of high ſpeculations, as the *Greeks* and *Romans* were, and yet know no other Tongues then their mothers; and what Languages, I pray you, did thoſe *Greeks* and *Romans* themſelves uſe in their ſublimeſt diſcourſes, but their mother Language? In fine, the practice of other Nations teſtifies, that the Councils prohibition reacheth not ſo far, if you think it did, I wonder you preſt it not home; look in his Preface, and you ſhall ſee this perform'd by him, both to his and my juſtification; of which yet you vouchſafe not to take the leaſt notice.

But I would heartily intreat you to conſider likewiſe thoſe branches of the Decree which concerns your party, and is a great deal more morall and important to vertue. *Incerta etiam vel quæ ſpecie falſi laborant vulgari ac tractari non permittant.* Uncertain devotions ought not to be divulged,

vulged, how much leſs violently preſſed? Were there but one clear ſentence of a Father for the opinion of ſouls being freed before Judgement; Were there any ground of it but unproveable revelations before the School? Did there any ancient School-man cenſure the contrary, did it not paſs in the Council of *Florence* for an indifferent opinion, and the contrary not to be exacted; Did not even at this day the graveſt School-men temper themſelves from cenſure, whatſoever their private opinion is, I might think this command might leſs concern you. But if none of this I have ſaid can be confuted, then lay your hand upon your heart, and think what is to be done. Remember in what language the ſcandalous deluſive promiſes annext to certain prayers are printed, and improvidently thruſt, as your Epiſtle calls it, into Ladies hands; look but a little about you, and you may perhaps, find motives enough to proceed very temperately in applying the Council of *Trent* againſt that worthy Perſon that tranſlated the Book, whoſe concluſion you diſlike, but confute not the Premiſes.

Your next oppoſition is about the day of Judgment, which you ſay is not to be prayed

prayed for, and your grounds are the dreadfulneſs of it, and a place out of Saint *Hilary*. And as for the dreadfulneſs, I pray conſider the words you cite: *Cum vix juſtus ſit ſecurus*, which if you pleaſe to mark, ſay the juſt ſhall be *ſecure*, that is, out of all fear. Conſider alſo the triumph the book of *Wiſdom* deſcribes, *Then that the juſt ſtand up in great aſſurance*, &c. And you your ſelf know it is the ſenſe of the whole Church, that even in Purgatory they are all ſecure of their ſalvation. As for Saint *Hierom*, he was yet in the ſtate of uncertainty, and therefore no wonder if he had a deep apprehenſion of it, being perpetually in thought of his ſins. But this was not the way which the ſpirit of God led Saint *Martin*, Saint *Ambroſe*, and a late Saint, who profeſſed, he rather deſired to live in uncertainty of his ſalvation ſo to gain ſouls, then to die immediately with ſecurity of going to heaven; nor the mind of Saint *Paul*, who deſired to be diſſolved, and accounted *death a gain*; ſo you ſee, one Saints apprehenſions are not to be the rule of the Church. We have our Saviours warrant & exhortation, even to them who ſhall ſee the diſorder of the heavens in way to judgment, to lift up their heads

with

with joy, that their redemption is neer. And Saint *Paul* calls the Saints, thoſe who *love Chriſts coming*. And our only Maſter teaches us to ſay, *Thy Kingdom come.*

Nevertheleſs, I admit that the frightfulneſs of that great ſcene of the Univerſall conflagration, may deterr ſpirits, weak and not confident of their ſtrength, from deſiring to be alive themſelves at that day, but not from deſiring to come when God hath prepared elect Saints fit to encounter thoſe terrors, and to pray that ſuch men may quickly be raiſed, which is more regardfull in their way, who think that even in æviternity the addition of time is of eminent conſequence. Briefly, in the day of Judgment, there are two things conſiderable; One, the terrors and dangers; in relation to which part, none can conceive we ought to pray for it: the other, the great rewards and benefits to be then diſtributed to ſuch as are found worthy; and in that reſpect nothing can poſſibly be more deſireable to a Chriſtian heart erected with hope, and enflamed with love of ſuch infinit felicity.

Your enſuing part brings in the difficulty of the fruit of prayer for the dead, of which I may truly pronounce, it is both

the

the easiest and hardest part of all this question: easiest to understand, hardest to perswade. And I hold my self bound to thank you, that you handle it like a grave and solid Divine, and not with whimsies (like my Vindicative Answerer) unworthy to be regarded, and able to turn a mans stomack that is bound to answer them; And yet fame threatens the world, with a second Tome of Christian doctrin, turned into jests by our Divine *Tortarin*.

Now to come to the point of the profit of prayer for the dead; wherein there are three considerations to be managed; first, what is the fruit of this prayer; secondly, what is obtained by it: and lastly, what comes to the speciall share of him who is prayed for. As to the first, remember that prayer is the substance of Christian life, recommended to us to be constant and perpetuall in all our actions; and let me add what you will not deny, in all our passions and defects: If we be so imperfect as to desire what is not fit for us, yet it pleases God, that even that, as long as it stands with ignorance that 'tis against his will, be demanded at his hands. For still there is a conversion of the soul to him, and many times so much the greater,

by

by how much the paſſion in us to the thing we deſire is the greater.

Turn your eyes on a Gentlewoman that hath loſt her husband, or dear child: ſee the paſſion ſhe is in, the ſorrow ſhe ſuffers, ſo far as ſhe conceives, her beloved loſs to be in miſery. Remember the words of Saint *Paul*, *Sicut qui ſpem non habent*, that is, inconſolably; put this Lady with all her paſſion into a conceit that her loſs is recoverable, that by her prayers to God, ſhe ſhall eternally enjoy the miſſed comfort in a plenitude of bliſs and happineſs. With what earneſtneſs of affection, with what a flood of tears, with what impetuouſneſs of heart doth ſhe embrace God and his goodneſs, and the hopes of heaven for her ſelf and hers: And will you after this tell me there is no fruit of prayer for the dead, and this dead in particular; ſince it hath ſo deep a ſtroke upon the living friends?

But your eye lay only upon the fruit of *impetration*. I pray therefore (not to repeat again how punctually all our expectation of ſucceſſive relief for thoſe ſouls by our prayers is verifyed in their ſimultaneous enjoyment of it;) tell me, is it to be underſtood, that a cauſe can make a thing be ſooner, and not make it be? It is plain then,

then if impetration be a causing or making the eternall reward come sooner, it is the causing of the eternall reward it self to come.

I can put this more home to You, who make no doubt but God so orders Beatitude to be the *End* of our works, that withall he orders our works to be the *means* of our Beatitude: so that it is perfectly true, if the works precede not, Beatitude shall not follow, notwithstanding the effectuall will by which God hath ordained it. For you understand that in Gods resolutions, there are no *ifs* and *ands*, as in ours; but that with one intuitive and strong act, he orders the means for the end, and the end by the means; and that all priority and posteriority is purely in the effects, none in his acts: And that Gods free disposition of creatures consists not, in that he can now determin what he list; but in that he hath determined what he lifted; or rather, that he is essentially the very determination of what he lifts.

But I exceed the bounds of what you think fit for a discourse to be vulgarly communicated, and therefore I return to my Theme, and conclude, if impetration of the day of Judgment be such a cause of it,

it, and of all that paſſes in it, true Divinity muſt confeſs, if this impetration be not, the day of Judgment ſhall not be, nor any effect in it; how can any Divine who underſtands the exactneſs of Gods working, deny, but, that the prayers for the dead by which its coming is procured, procure the very happineſs it ſelf of the party for whom he prayes, and brings him to the crown to which his *merits call him*, as St. *Ambroſe* ſpeaks; ſo that you ſee the difficulty of this point conſiſts in this, that thoſe who are not Divines, do not underſtand the connexion of Gods works, and how it is true, that if any one circumſtance ordain'd by God to bring about ſuch an effect ſhould fail, the effect it ſelf would have no ſucceſs.

By which the third conſideration is made manifeſt, that the party for whom the prayer is made obtains by vertue of ſuch prayer, not only his own glory and every accidental part of bliſs allotted to him, but beſides, obliges all the Saints of God, by being the occaſion that by the prayer made for him, all their bliſs reſpectively comes to atchievment, how hard ſo ever it be to ſtamp a full conceit of this into the heads of the common ſort.

Your ſecond Argument preſſes that the coming of the day of Judgment concerns the living as well, or more, then the dead; I will not queſtion whether it doth or no, but I ask, what doth that prejudice the prayer, if it helps more then the maker of it thinks on? unleſs you imagin the good people pray like the little boy, whoſe prayer was, that God would bleſs his father and mother, and brothers and ſiſters, and no body elſe. I have not learn'd any ſuch reſtriction of charity, nor did he teach it, who bids us in his own Prayer call him *Pater noſter*, not *Pater mi*; And told us he knew well (that is better then we) what we wanted, and that our deſires ſhould be after the Kingdom of God, and all other things would be added to us; as, to *Salomons* Petition of Wiſdom, beſides the grant of it, were added thoſe felicities he did not pray for.

And me thinks the reaſon is cleer; for if our charity be the adequate cauſe of impetrating what we beg rationally of God, and God is not ignorant of what is fit for us, certainly, in reſpect of our charity, he will do it, ſo we be carefull to increaſe that, whether we ask it him or no. Look the *Pater noſter* thorow, and ſee if you find

find any other object of prayer then the good of the world in common, and the neceſſaries to our own perfection. Other prayers are fram'd in condeſcenſion to our weakneſs, who do not cleanſe our ſouls from particular deſires, and are good and commendable to the proportion of divers abilities. But if all could attain the perfection of deſiring nothing but what charity commands, it would be better both for the living and the dead, even in the way of impetration, though particulars were never thought on. Nevertheleſs, ſince the world is the world, this Article of praying for the dead, is as neceſſary as our imperfection (which is not like to leave us) muſt needs make it, both in common and in particular, as we ſee it uſed.

The reſt of your Chapter is ſo ſpeculative, that I could willingly have omitted it, but becauſe you recommend it to be weighed, I cannot neglect it. I pray then take notice, that in Saint *Thomas* his way, the compoſition of ſpirits is not of materiality and ſpirituality, but of eſſence and exiſtence, a compoſition whoſe ſeparability or conjunction belongs purely to the activity of God, and is not a *potentia*, but a *non repugnantia*, and ſo can have no

cauſe under God, whoſe eſſence is in the order of exiſtence, or rather the order it ſelf, no other ſubſtance reaching to that order. Out of which is inferr'd, that as to create and annihilate, that is, to change exiſtence *per ſe*, belongs only to God; ſo likewiſe doth any change in a pure ſpirit which cannot have its ſource in a conjoyned body. Thoſe who put a kind of materiality which they do not explicate, whether they ſpeak conſequently or no, I cannot judge, but I know *Tully* makes ſport with the *Epicureans* for giving their gods, *quaſi carnem*, and *quaſi ſanguinem*, without being able to explicate them further. Beſides, that a demonſtration could be grounded upon propoſitions whoſe ſenſe was not comprehended and explained, I never read in *Ariſtotle*.

Saint *Bonaventure* (if his ordinary citers do him no wrong) makes duration to be truly diviſible *in infinitum*, which, that it ſhould agree to any thing, but either quantity, or by quantity, Peripateticks or any other ſolid Logician, think to imply as much as being diviſible, without diviſibility. To his Reaſon and the two following inconveniences, S^t. *Thomas*'s Scholars uſe the diſtinction of infinit in its *particular*

cular kind; and infinit *ſimply*, or in *all kinds*; and ſay this later onely belongs to God Almighty; and that if there were an infinit quantity, it would not therefore be God, nor that if an Angel know all ſpecieſes of numbers or figures, therefore he knows all things. Nay, that becauſe the intellect is but a paſſive faculty of it ſelf is there any infinit vigor required to knowledge, though infinit, ſo it be purely infuſed, as likewiſe that the vigor of infinit duration is in the Conſerver, not in the thing conſerved; ſo that I doubt much how valuable theſe arguments can be made, though you ſeem confident of them, even more then of the Demonſtration of *Euclid* and *Archimedes*, whom you think apt to ſwallow ſuppoſitions without proof, which is miſtaken, unleſs you ſpeak of ſome ſelf-known Axioms, which I think you alſo will admit.

By the way I would intreat you to quote me ſome place of Scripture in which any Angel is recorded to have had a new internall act, for I know no ſuch; though externall actions they have manifold; and ſo I end this Chapter, noting, that whereas you cite my Peripateticall Inſtitutions for my opinion of Purgatory, that their

teſtimony is not ſufficient to declare my opinion in Divinity matters; the neceſſity of good method forcing me to abſtain from Theologicall reſolution in a Philoſophical Treatiſe. I could rather have wiſht you had taken more notice of the little book I wrote expreſly concerning this very queſtion; where the whole buſineſs is largely treated, the Objections rais'd, and Anſwers offer'd; many authorities produc'd, and many Reaſons; to none of which, can I any way conceive, you have much applied your thoughts; and ſo if they perhaps deſerve no anſwer, I am ſure they have none.

Notes on the eighth and ninth Chapters.

IN your eighth Chapter you trouble your ſelf, whether it be poſſible for the ſouls in purgatory to ſee the humanity of Chriſt, which I am ſo far from diſputing with you, that I willingly acknowledge it; and withall, that it raiſes a great heighth of

of charity in him, ſo that their ſtate in Purgatory is far beyond the ſtate of this life for charity, but yet that it takes not away the dregs of ſin left in them at their death. Not that I think Saint *Paul* ſpeaks of any ſuch matter in the place you cite, but the meaning of thoſe words, *In corpore an extra corpus neſcio*, is, that he knew not whether his body was truly carry'd locally into the third heaven, or only that he had a ſight of it, as Saint *Stephen* had of Chriſt in the place where he ſtood, and ſo the ſenſe may be, whether the rapture was in his body, or only in his mind. For elſe we muſt conceive him dead in the mean while, which I know not that any affirm; and otherwiſe theſe be two ſpecies of the three which Divines make of Viſions.

To enquire then why the ſins are not taken away in Purgatory; though I could anſwer you, that it is becauſe they are *in termino*; and your Divines tell us they cannot merit nor demerit; Yet both I and you may ask how this is proved, and whither we go conſequently. I could anſwer again, that it is for want of fancy, or of an *intellectus agens*. But you would reply, God ſupernaturally ſupplies that, and I ſhould

think God doth not nor cannot prudently change his ſetled order of cauſes meerly by favour, and becauſe he will, without the profit of the world. Therefore I muſt briefly ſay, it is the reſult of nature, and that the coexiſtence of compoſſible deſires impeaches not the duration of theſe weak affections, ſince God acts not but by infuſion of new exiſtence, as in the reſurrection. He that will aſſert miracles without proof, plays not the Divine, but puts all in confuſion.

For this Interrogation, Cannot God do it? carries ſuch an awfull aſpect, that it ſeems to lay the imputation of Atheiſm on him who dares ſo much as doubt it; yet you, and all good Divines know, it ſignifies no more, then whether the effect implies contradiction; which may be diſputed without horror, nay, peradventure not ſo much; for if God cannot do in particular, but what is beſt, he that can ſhew a thing to be not beſt(how poſſible ſo ever it be) exempts it from the force of that Interrogation. And although I could largely diſcourſe of this later part, even by your own occaſion, who grant the courſe of nature to be for me, yet to make this ſpeculative part as ſhort as I can, I will

will only inſiſt upon contradiction, how ever I fear, few more then your ſelf will be capable of the diſcourſe.

I pray therefore reflect that when Philoſophers agree, Identity of Time is neceſſary to contradiction, it is not out of the nature of Time it ſelf, which being an extrinſecall accident, hath not power to make any thing compoſſible or incompoſſible in the ſubject where they imply contradiction; but it muſt be the nature of the ſubject it ſelf, which being ſuſceptive of as great mutability as time hath mutation, is *in potentia* another thing to the proportion of the changes of time; as, becauſe a man who walks can ſtop, and the flame of a candle go out in an inſtant; therefore the conſiſtency of a material ſubject, as to our minds conſideration, is but moment-ſtrong; and we can affirm nothing of it in force of contradiction more durable then the unchangeableneſs or identity of time, which is purely a thought or an abſtraction: Out of this it follows, that if we put in ſpirituall ſubſtances, a more then momentanean conſtancy, we muſt alſo put the force of contradiction in them proportionable to that conſtancy or identity of it ſelf to it ſelf. Now your ſelf

ſeeming

ſeeming to admit this conſtancy under the name of æviternity in ſpirits, for a future eternity; it ſeems to me you ſhould admit nothing in ſpirits that is not compoſſible together in the ſubject, and by evident conſequence that not to have an act, and to have one in the ſame æviternity, is as impoſſible as not to have, and to have in the ſame inſtant of time.

You will peradventure tell me, this poſition ruins ſome common opinions in Divinity, and my brittle Vindicator would tell me *it moulder'd away his faith:* Sir, if you be of the opinion that Theology is arriv'd to its *non plus ultra*, I am not. I think many now common and probable opinions, will in after ages be demonſtrated againſt, and prove erroneous: and therefore the pure authority of Divines, who build upon pure reaſon, hath no farther force with me then their reaſon. And I think I have learned this leſſon out of Saint *Auguſtin*, as I am ſure your ſelf alſo have, how ever in practice apparences may ſeduce you from the exerciſe of it; as if you believe it conſonant to Scriptures, Fathers, Councils, *&c.* without a legitimate examination of them: which when you go about, you find them to be eaſily eluded by the

the gloſſes of blaſted Authors, many of which kind of Authors nevertheleſs Saint *Hierom* in his Comments upon the Scriptures was uſed to cite, that men of underſtanding might ſee in the variety of divers conceits what truths might be picked out, even of blaſted Authors, as *Ariſtotle* out of the verities mingled among falſe opinions drew his own demonſtrations. The reſt of theſe Chapters is but an explication indifferent to both ſides, in which as you admit in Purgatory a diſpoſition to charity, ſo me thinks you ſhould to the change of affections by it: And whereas you ſay that the ſoul is *extra viam*, the common Tenet of Divines ſhould admoniſh you that ſhe is not in ſtate to have new revelations and changes which are the propriety of *Via*.

Notes on the tenth Chapter.

WHich is, for its Poſitions, entirely true and holy; but you ſeem to ſuppoſe as true, ſome miſinformations, or miſapprehenſions concerning your Adverſary,

ſary, as that he queſtions generall traditions, and calls them novelties; which how you can do who know Saint *Auſtin* teſtifies in his time, as yet the queſtion was not agitated, and that each part might prove either true or falſe, and that the Authour of the celebrated Dialogues expreſly teaches they were unknown till his dayes, and from thence till Saint *Odilo*'s time very little eſteemed or noyſed; How ſuch an opinion can chuſe but be a *Novelty* in reſpect of the Church of God, I cannot underſtand, or that ſix hundred years ago with *a known beginning*, can enroll it into the practices or doctrins delivered by the Apoſtles, paſſes my reach. As for the univerſall ſenſe of the Church, I hope the Council of *Florence*'s act will demonſtrate the contrary, as you may ſee in my anſwer to the Vindicator; whither I beg leave to remit you.

The Text you cite out of Saint *Auſtin* is excellently true, *Quæ univerſa tenet Eccleſia ab Apoſtolis præcepta, bene creduntur, quanquam ſcripta non reperiantur*; but with theſe cautions, That the Church (that is, the community of Believers, as ſuch, not as a multitude of men) *hold them as of faith*, not opine them only to be current truths; elſe

elſe every common perſwaſion grounded on any probable Reaſon or Authority, would become an unchangeable Article of Chriſtian Religion; and in this, I think, I have your conſent, if I miſtake not the the 32. Chapter of your *Syſtema*, which I formerly cited, and deſire my Reader to peruſe the whole Chapter, being excellently pertinent to this purpoſe: As alſo *Verons* general Rule of Catholike faith, which I hear is newly tranſlated into *Engliſh*.

There you ſhall ſee how warily that experienced Controvertiſt proceeds in ſeparating faith from opinions: No doctrin, ſays he, begun ſince the Apoſtles, though confirm'd by miracles, and thoſe miracles reported by Saints, or approved by generall Councils, or atteſted in the Bulls of canonization can ever be an Article of faith; Nor is the practice, ſays the ſame Auhor, even of the univerſall Church a ground firm enough to build a point of Catholike faith upon; becauſe the object of faith is truth, and the Church often guides her practices by probable opinions, which upon occaſion ſhe may change. And for Decrees of Councils, the ſame Doctor maintains, and cites *Bellarmin* for his opinion; that unleſs the Council proceed

ceed *concilliarly*, that is, by due examination, *&c.* and define *properly*, not barely affirm a thing by simple assertion, and occasionally, as it were, *en passant*: it does not oblige our belief; and which is highest of all, though the Council decree expresly and professedly a Doctrin debated, yet unless it be defined as a truth to be *believed with Catholike faith*, they are not properly heretiques that hold the contrary.

What you deliver that one mans satisfaction may by way of impetration satisfie for another, and profit him, is very acceptable; and none but they who mistake the words, can dislike the sense; for we see humiliations accompany solemn prayers, both in the Law of *Moses*, and Grace; and nature it self teaches us, it is a convenient habit for him that intreats mercy.

Notes on the eleventh Chapter.

WHere I see very little for me particularly to except against, but that you term our Tenet, an *Innovation*, which name better becomes your own:

But

But this is an Indulgence to be granted to the conceit every one has of his own arguments; For the opinion, that the ſenſitive or corporeall part of man is capable of venial ſin in it ſelf, and ſo of goodneſs; I neither have nor will have any thing to do with it; You ſay 'tis taught by *the moſt ſpeculative Divines, as* Scotus's *Scool, and* Cajetan, *&c.* I dare not meddle with ſuch great men. As for your Opiniators you ſpeak of, I cannot point you to a fairer example then the Vindicators Creed, which he hath declared to be his faith, in his Diſcourſe againſt me. To the touch you give about probable opinions, the queſtion is too great to engage in on ſo ſlight an occaſion. The place you quote out of Saint *Auſtin*, ſeems not to concern the queſtion, being only about the meaning of a Text of Scripture; however the ſaying is a very good ſaying.

Concerning ſome *ſeeming excreſcencies*, as you call them, in practical Devotion, you ſpeak like a grave man; you diſlike them indeed, but in ſuch ſoft and gentle words, that none but a very tender ear will feel the ſtroke; *they have no ſtrict acquaintance with Church orders*, they are *onely a ſort of Bigotterie*; which is a dark word,

word, and many of the perſons moſt concern'd, will leaſt underſtand it. Much after this faſhion did old *Eli* chide his ſons, who had got an ill-favour'd trick to fetch up with a new invented fork, part of the ſacrifice out of the Caldron, and cheat the people of the fat of their offerings: What ſays the old father to his ſons for this? *Quare facitis res hujuſmodi*, &c. *Nolite filii mei, non enim eſt bona fama quam ego audio, ut tranſgredi faciatis populum Domini.* And almoſt thus far you ſeem angry too, but is this enough? Have you ſufficiently contributed to the ſecure diſparagingſuch exorbitances, like a free and zealous Divine? ſhould you not have branded 'em particularly and ſmartly, as being not only (ſure even in your own judgment) notgood, but abominable & deteſtable? let any indifferent perſon ſeriouſly conſider the intolerable flattering promiſes, unwarrantably and ſcandalouſly applyd to certain praiers, and other actions (good enough of themſelves, but incredibly abuſed by ſuch falſe and covetous Merchants) and he will find you might have ſeaſonably applyd a little ſharper correction, then what imports they are only in *ſtrict* account not juſtifiable. This, I confeſs, is not our direct Controverſy,

yet

yet is it more cenſurable, only in degree, then an eager inviting of people to beſtow alms, with promiſe of a ſpeedy delivery out of Purgatory, eſpecially, if they name the day, as I think ſome priviledg'd Altars venture to do.

Notes on the twelfth Chapter.

IN which, you juſtly ſay, it is a moſt uncertain thing to determin of ſouls in Purgatory, how long they ſtay there, and *that indeed, there is neither reaſon nor revelation to conduct us in that ſpeculation*; which is very true, and I ſhall ſeek to confirm it by the teſtimony of the Church of *Rome*, or at leaſt, of the *Pope*, who takes the granting of Indulgences to be his perſonall priviledge; If we believe the Author of the *Roman* Hiſtory of *Trent*, who ſeems to ſpeak it out of good warrant. I give you the words of an Author, writing and printing in *Rome*, not full twenty years ſince, and therefore who credibly was an eye-witneſs of what he wrote. *Audiatur* (ſaith he) *verborum formula qua utuntur*

Romani Pontifices in ſuis de liberandis Animabus conceſſionibus, and annexeth for the form theſe words: *Nos divina miſericordia confiſi concedimus, ut quotieſcumque ſacerdos in tali loco Miſſam celebraverit pro liberatione unius animæ in Purgatorio exiſtentis quæ per charitatem Deo unita ab hac luce deceſſit, & piorum ſuffragiis juvari meruit, ipſa anima, quantum Divinæ bonitati placuerit, opportunis de theſauris Eccleſiæ ſubſidiis adjuta, peccatorum remiſſionem conſequatur, & de pœnis Purgatoriis facilius valeat ad cœleſtem patriam pervenire.* Where you ſee, that notwithſtanding a ſoul enjoys the priviledge granted to ſuch Altars; ſhe may ſtay in Purgatory till doomſday. And that none of our opinion have reaſon to abſtain from the uſe of priledg'd Altars, and the like Indulgences for the dead, or do well, if they ſpeak againſt them; but ought to cry out againſt the abuſe of thoſe who perſwade innocent ſouls of ſtrange vertues which were never granted them, and ſo delude them with hopes for which they have no ground.

Nevertheleſs, I deſire you to reflect, that if this be the profeſſion of the *Roman* Church, concerning the ſouls which ſeem to have an eminent favour & degree in Chriſts merits

merits and the prayers of the univerſall Church, that it can be no greater in reſpect of thoſe ſouls which have only the private interceſſion of friends; whence we may gather, that ſuch mediations make them not come ſooner then other ſouls, but *eaſilier* to the Kingdom of heaven.

I wonder alſo that you being neer a *Jubilate Divine*, ſhould make difficulty to cenſure an opinion; what is there more of difficulty in cenſuring then in approving, nay then in determining a caſe to be Uſury or Simony? Are there not divers kinds of cenſuring? Some juridical, and they ſuppoſe ſuperiority: Some unappealable, and they ſuppoſe ſupremacy: Some only rationall, and they need no more then Equality; and with reference to this laſt branch, you and I may freely *cenſure* or *approve* of one anothers ſayings, as we ſee cauſe; In this very Chapter, do not you charge my opinion with *Novelty*, and conſequently with falſhood? which ſurely is a kinde of cenſure: and as for the conſequence it ſelf, I ſhall eaſily admit it in Faith, but not in Opinions; which I conceive may poſſibly be new, and true too.

I have no more to note concerning your

Book, unleſs I ſhould mark that you ſeem to make *Participem eſſe fidei Romanæ*, all one with *ſubmitting to the deciſions of Rome*; but that concerns not our preſent queſtion; yet I deſire you would be more rigorous in your interpretations, that ſo the credit of your citations may be the greater. Only three things come into my mind, which I forgot to note in their proper places; one ſhould have been about the middle of your fourth Chapter, where you would eſcape the Argument drawn from the frequent mention of the Day of Judgment in the *Roman* Liturgy; by ſaying, 'twas *partly, that the dead might receive comfort before the laſt terrible day; neither can the words have any other ſenſe.* Pray read over the *ſequentia* again. Can theſe words, *Ne me perdas illa die, inter oves locum præſta*, &c. *Confutatis maledictis, flammis acribus addictis, voca me cum benedictis*; &c. have no other ſenſe but delivery before the day of Judgement? Joyn to theſe the prayers of the Breviary; *Cum veneris in noviſſimo die: dum veneris indicare ſeculum per ignem, libera me Domine de morte eterna in die illa tremenda*, &c. And indeed, all over the offices for the dead. Can none of theſe words have any

any other ſenſe, then releaſe before the day of Judgement? Is it poſſible the Churches prayers ſhould be thus croſs interpreted, that where we expreſly pray for delivery *in the day of Judgment*, you ſhould think we muſt neceſſarily mean *before* the day of Judgment?

Another note which I omitted concerns your firſt Chapter, where you treated of Revelations. For farther anſwer to which, I would offer you a notable example of no leſs a Perſon then *Gregory* the ninth, who conſidering the ill ſucceſs of the deſigns he had undertaken at the inſtance of *Peter* of *Arragon*, and upon the aſſurances of St. *Bridget*, and St. *Katherin* of *Siena* (who ſpake with great confidence of knowing the mind of God) being now in his laſt ſickneſs, took the B. Sacrament in his hands, and with moſt ſolemn and fervent intreaties, conjur'd his ſucceſſors not to govern themſelves by the Viſions of ſuch perſons as give no *reaſon* for their counſels. Compare now the probabilities of your Revelations with theſe that deceiv'd this good *Pope*. Reflect firſt on the perſons engag'd; a famous Ermit, and two canoniz'd Saints pretend to have it immediately from God, on the one ſide:

on the other, (that is, on yours) ſome well meaning people perhaps, and devout Pilgrims (the graver Perſons that write of ſuch curioſities being generally, if not altogether, bare relaters of what they hear from others) tell ſtrange tales of Viſions and Apparitions ſometimes to themſelves, ſometimes to their neighbours, of which not one in a hundred but has ſomething of ridiculous or ſuperſtitious: Remember the poor ſoul that was put to ſcrub and waſh in the Baths at *Rome*, mentioned in thoſe you will call Saint *Gregory's* Dialogues. Read well Saint *Bedes* Revelations (I mean thoſe he as an Hiſtorian recounts to have happen'd to others, as they ſaid) and you will find beſides heaven, hell, and a *penal* place where imperfect Chriſtians are *puniſht* (that is Purgatory) that Revelation tells us of a fourth, where was no puniſhment at all, but in it *agmina lætantia, fœlices Incolæ*, &c. Now, let us ask in the name of Faith and Divinity what place is this? The Revealer puts it utterly void of pain, (and ſo neither Hell nor Purgatory) and full of joy; nay ſo full, that he could not imagin greater, and ſo took it for Heaven; but the Angel which guarded him checkt him in that thought,

thought, and ſhew'd him Heaven afterwards. What! Divine can acquaint us with ſo much as the name of this place, or explicate to us why in Juſtice the very little imperfect Chriſtians whom he places in this gay place, ſhould not feel ſome pain proportion'd to their fault, as wel as the venially more imperfect ſouls had to theirs; and theſe ſo horrid too, that he who had the Viſion, took the place for Hell. Again, he affirms abſolutely of thoſe very little imperfect ſouls that they all go to Heaven *in the day of Judgment*, and the ſelf ſame of thoſe ſeen in Purgatory, which makes the words following concerning ſome coming ſooner ſubjoyn'd to this later, ſeem an addition, no ſuch words being annex'd to the other ſtate; whereas me thinks according to the doctrin even of my oppoſers, thoſe who needed little or no purging, ſhould come to heaven ſooner. In a word, this fourth place either contain'd ſouls perfect in charity, and then 'tis the hereſy of *John* 22. to hold it; or imperfect, that is, to be purg'd, and yet in no penal place, that is, not in Purgatory, which is equally oppoſit to Catholiciſm. How ſtrange a thing is it then that men ſhould build us Articles of Faith upon Re-

velations, which are at leaſt ſubcontrary to Faith. Beſides, which is remarkable, Saint *Gregory* and Saint *Bede*, are not pretended revealers, or aſcertaining the Viſions on their own experience, but upon the teſtimony of others they could never be aſſur'd of; whereas thoſe other engag'd the teſtimonys of the Saints themſelves, and yet miſcarry'd moſt utterly.

After theſe two Revelations of the Dialogues and *Bede*, there is none (for any thing I know) more authentique for this point, then that which you recount in your firſt Chapter, uſher in ſo ſolemnly, and rely on ſo aſſuredly; how that once upon a time, a certain dead mans skul told a certain holy man, that every time he pray'd for the dead, *we feel*, ſaid the deaths-head, *ſome comfort*. Now, as ill luck would have it, this was the skul of a meer Heathen; and ſo, if heathens uſe to go to Hell and not to Purgatory, it might ſound indeed in behalf of the damned, but not the leaſt concern thoſe in Purgatory, for whoſe relief only the Church prays. Next, conſider the things they meddle with; the one ſide fairly foretold what in time we could diſcover the truth of, and ſo was

concern'd

concern'd to be wary; and the matter it ſelf ſo far from incredible, that it was not improbable: Your ſide tell ſtories far more craftily, ſuch as can never be diſproved, ſuch as may defy all the world to diſcover any falſhood in them; but hold a little, all this high confidence, I doubt, is not granted on their aſſuredneſs of truth, but impoſſibilty of triall: for who can detect the fraud of ſuch ſubtil Merchants, who pay us in coyn that no touchſtone can examin? who can charge them, as thoſe miſtaken ones in *Gregory* the ninth's caſe were by dear experience of the whole Chriſtian world in the miſcarriage of the Holy War lamentably confuted? Many other inſtances there are, which all conſpire to the confirmation of the holy *Popes* wiſe advice; let them give *Reaſon* for their promiſes.

The third note, which I think, I alſo omitted, relates to your conceſſion that *by the order of Nature ſouls in the ſtate of ſeparation are abſolutely immutable, and cannot change their poſture from Purgatory to Heaven, but ſupernaturally they may*: If you mean by *ſupernaturality*, the extraordinary power of God, I agree with you; and ſo our controverſy will be at an end: but

but if you mean any constant *ordinary* way appointed by God to effect that change before the day of Judgment; I conceive it very reasonable some cleer evidence be produced, such as may warrant an Opinion, that by your own Tenet so directly crosses the course of nature: when I see that, you shall immediately find me most ready to submit: till then, I hope neither you, nor any of my fiercest opposers will have the least just cause to condemn me.

If after this you demand, How shall we distinguish what the Church or Councils teach to be believed *as of Faith* from other doctrins promiscuously delivered? First, I do not remember this Objection any where insisted on by either of my late Opponents; and I am very slow to stir farther then I am mov'd; and indeed, think it inconvenient to start new game, before we have hunted down the old. Secondly, Are not you oblig'd as well as I, to provide an answer for such a Question? I am confident that the strictest of you do not hold all that is taught in the Church, or defin'd by Councils, even in doctrin and manners, are Apostolicall Revelations; if you agree with me so far, why

why do you think me bound to ſever the points of rigorous Catholique Faith from Tenets of an inferiour degree, rather then your ſelves? where we are all indifferently concern'd, why do you exact the performance from me alone, as if it were not your duty as well as mine? not that I conceive it impoſſible to be done to full ſatisfaction, but that I am no more engaged to do it then you; though perhaps upon occaſion of a *ſecond Eſſay*, I may offer my endeavours towards the cleering that point; eſpecially ſhould my Vindicator proceed cloſe and pertinently like a ſerious man, and an ingenious Schollar; for ſo I ſhould have more time to attend on the weightier matters. And moſt of all, if he would enlarge himſelf a little upon the ſame Queſtion in his next Vindication, for I ſhall be glad to be directed and aſſiſted by any one.

But if any be ſo unexperienc'd as to imagin all that is deliver'd or decreed is abſolutely of Faith, let him ſatisfie the inſtances commonly urg'd by Divines of the *Aſſumption* of our Bleſſed Lady, of the ſouls being the *Form* of our body, and many other ſuch truths univerſally aſſented to, but not admitted into the Catalogue

logue of Articles. In fine, if this laſt be your opinion, you will find very few wiſe men of your mind; if the former, you are equally concern'd with me to ſeparate Catholike from Theologicall Faith, or any other Propoſition of inferiour qualification.

The Concluſion.

THus have you my Opinion on your *Reſult*, as full and particular as can be expected from a weak underſtanding ſubject to negligence and overſight; yet to my power, ſincere and captive to the love of truth. I hope you cannot be offended at my oppoſitions, for I have that eſteem of you, that you are a lover of truth, and not ſway'd by paſſion or intereſt, but only prejudiced by the force of cuſtom, and the reverence of School-opinions. Cenſures, though I think they belong to the duty of a Divine, fit to ſhew his works to the Sun, yet in this piece I have uſed none. And though the unwary compliance of this age with Error makes

me

me eſteem'd cenſorious, yet my heart told me I was oblig'd to do ſo when ever I engag'd my Pen into it, and that I ſpared far more Opinions juſtly blameable, then I cenſured; becauſe I deemed them not ſo pernicious as to force me to it. The ſtyle I have not much regarded, holding that both the matter and my age warn me not to be ſollicitous of it, but rather to ſpeak, *quinque verba in meo ſenſu, quam decem millia verborum in lingua.* In a word, if I gain your Opinion of my *ſincerity*, let the Controverſy it ſelf ſpeak for the *truth*, and the reaſons which are on both ſides. I muſt acknowledge my ſelf ever obliged to you, that you have ſhewn our Catholiques how to demean themſelves with moderation towards one another in litigious diſputes, and with theſe thanks make way to your credulity, that I am

Your cordiall Friend and Servant,

THOMAS WHITE.

Postscript.

Being inform'd that some few scrupulous, and I fear, unsatisfiable persons object against my Religion and Reason, *that it takes no notice of those words* [even before the Resumption of their bodies, &c.] *on which they chiefly ground; I could not, I confess, at first, but wonder at their prejudice, which had so imprinted those words in their fancyes in* Capitall, *that they could not see or know them in a lesser Character. For I not onely took notice of them in my* 34 *and* 35 *pages, and put them down at large, as in the Bull cited by themselves, but addrest my self purposely there to show them as impossible to favour their Cause, as 'tis that the Subject of a Proposition should be the Predicate; which every smatterer knows to be in Logick the highest absurdity imaginable. Besides, in divers other places of my Book where any thing was attempted or urg'd from those words, I offer'd my satisfaction to their difficulties: with what success the Books must shew. In the mean time, I crave the favour (upon occasion of their miscarriage in this) that none would lend too easie credit to objections whispered*

in

in corners, which are afraid to appear and juſtifie themſelves in writing under their hands. If any ſuch be offer'd, I ſhall both take it as a favour, and acknowledge it my duty to ſatisfie them. If not, 'tis ſo like the way of clamour and detraction, that all perſons meanly prudent, will, I hope, neglect them; and ſo ſhall I.

INDEX.

Æ viternal things not changable by Time. p. 37. 38.
S. Ambroſe's *Teſtimony not prejudiciall, p.* 29. 30.
The opinion of Ante judiciary Delivery by occaſioning the multitude of unworthy Prieſts, harmfull to the Church, p. 5. 6. *impairing ſolid Devotion, p.* 6. 7. *injuring civill Duties, if follow'd, p.* 7. *Fraudulently practis'd by many,* ibid. *The Effects of it, if true, uncertain. p.* 9. 10. *The Church not chargeable with theſe Abuſes, p.* 10.
Cenſures allowable among Divines, p. 67.
S. Chryſoſtom's *Teſtimony not prejudiciall, p* 31, 32.
Charity to be uſed in managing Opinions, and why, p. 12, 13.
Compoſition how found in Spirits, p. 51, 52.
Delivery in the day of Judgment, not ſingular in being univerſally held, yet but an Opinion, p. 12. 16. 18. 19. 26. 61. *not prejudic'd by Priviledg'd Altars, and Indulgences rightly underſtood, and ſincerely*

ly practis'd, p. 65, 66.
Delivery from Hell pray'd for in the offertory, p. 34, 35.
Devotions not warrantable, glanc't at, p. 63, 64, 65.
Identity of Time, why necessary to Contradiction, p. 57.
Judgment-day desirable, p. 43, 44, 45.
Language concerning Spirits, how verifiable, p. 21, 22, 23, &c.
Penance, how held by the Authour, p. 38, 39.
Prayer, when perfectest, p. 50, 51.
Prayer for the dead manifoldly beneficiall, p. 45. to p. 50. of equall efficacy in the deniers as the holders of Ante judiciary Delivery p. 30, 31.
Priority of Nature not found in a pure Indivisible p. 38.
Relief in Purgatory in the Authors Doctrin, from p. 20. to p. 28.
Revelations even of great Saints, how errable, p. 69. Those of Gregory and Bede generally contradicted, p. 32, 33. 72. This later unconsonant to Faith, p. 70. 71. That of the dead Skull examin'd, p. 14, 15, 16. 72.
Sins remaining in Purgatory, granted, p. 39.
Souls separate why unchangeable in true Peripatetick Doctrin, p. 40, 41. This Incapacity of change, the Result of their nature, p. 55, 56. In what sence supernaturally deliverable before Judgment, p. 73, 74.
Tradition alone sufficient for Faith, p. 35, 36.
Translating the Middle State not criminally scandalous p. 4, 5. but judiciously pious, p. 10. occasioned by others, p. 11. Not this, but the Adversaries carriage, forbid by the Council of Trent, p. 42, 43.

FINIS.